arXiv:1302.5336v1 [quant-ph] 21 Feb 2013

On equalities in two entropic inequalities*

M.E. Shirokov
Steklov Mathematical Institute, RAS, Moscow
msh@mi.ras.ru

Abstract

A simple criterion for local equality between the constrained Holevo capacity and the quantum mutual information of a quantum channel is obtained. It implies that the set of all states for which this equality holds is determined by the kernel of the channel (as a linear map).

Applications to Bosonic Gaussian channels are considered. It is shown that for a Gaussian channel having no completely depolarizing components the above characteristics may coincide only at non-Gaussian mixed states and a criterion of existence of such states is given.

All the obtained results may be reformulated as conditions for equality between the constrained Holevo capacity of a quantum channel and the input von Neumann entropy.

1 Introduction

The constrained Holevo capacity $\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)$ (also called χ-function) and the quantum mutual information $I(\Phi,\rho)$ are important characteristics of a quantum channel Φ related respectively to the classical capacity and to the entanglement-assisted classical capacity of this channel [1, 5, 10]. These nonnegative characteristics have the following upper bounds

$$\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)\leq H(\rho),\qquad I(\Phi,\rho)\leq 2H(\rho),\tag{1}$$

---

*This work was partially supported by the program “Mathematical control theory and dynamical systems” of RAS and by the RFBR grants 12-01-00319a and 13-01-00295a.

where $H(\rho)$ is the von Neumann entropy of a state ρ, and are connected by the inequality

$$\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho) \leq I(\Phi,\rho). \tag{2}$$

The sense of equality in the second inequality in (1) is well known: it is equivalent to perfect reversibility of the channel Φ on the support of the state ρ [5, 10]. In this paper we analyse conditions of equalities in the first inequality in (1) and in (2) strengthening the results obtained in [15].

In fact, these inequalities are connected via the complementary channel $\widehat{\Phi}$ to the channel Φ [5, 6]. This follows from the identity

$$I(\Phi,\rho) - \bar{C}(\Phi,\rho) = H(\rho) - \bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho)$$

valid for any state ρ with finite von Neumann entropy $H(\rho)$ (see Section 2). This identity shows, in particular, that

$$\{\, \bar{C}(\Phi,\rho) = I(\Phi,\rho) < +\infty \,\} \Leftrightarrow \{\, \bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho) = H(\rho) < +\infty \,\}.$$

So, we may analyse conditions of equality in the first inequality in (1) by studying conditions of equality in (2) and vice versa.

This idea was used in [15] to show that equality in (2) implies that the restriction of the channel Φ to the set of all states σ such that $\mathrm{supp}\sigma \subseteq \mathrm{supp}\rho$ is a (discrete) c-q channel (this was a basis step in proving the conditions for coincidence of the Holevo capacity and the entanglement-assisted classical capacity of a finite-dimensional channel).

In this paper we prove a simple criterion of equality in (2) for an infinite dimensional channel Φ and a state ρ with finite (von Neumann) entropy. This criterion shows that the set of all mixed states with finite entropy, for which equality in (2) holds, is expressed via the set $\ker\Phi$ (Theorem 3). It also makes it possible to prove that this equality holds for all states ρ if and only if Φ is a completely depolarizing channel (the fact conjectured in [15]).

We consider application of the obtained results to Bosonic Gaussian channels. In particular, we show that for an arbitrary non-completely-depolarizing Gaussian channel Φ a strict inequality holds in (2) for all non-degenerate states with finite entropy, while its validity for all mixed states with finite entropy is equivalent to the "full rank" property of the operator describing transformation of canonical observables.

The "complementary" results concerning an equality (strict inequality) in the first inequality in (1) are presented in the last part of the paper.

2 Pleriminaries

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a separable Hilbert space, $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})$ – the Banach spaces of all bounded operators in $\mathcal{H}$ and of all trace-class operators in $\mathcal{H}$ correspondingly, $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ – the closed convex subset of $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})$ consisting of positive operators with unit trace called *states* [5, 10].

Denote by $I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{H}}$ the unit operator in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and the identity transformation of the Banach space $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})$ correspondingly.

Let $H(\rho)$ and $H(\rho\|\sigma)$ be respectively the von Neumann entropy of the state ρ and the quantum relative entropy of the states ρ and σ [5, 10].

A finite or countable collection of states $\{\rho_i\}$ with the corresponding probability distribution $\{\pi_i\}$ is called *ensemble* and denoted $\{\pi_i,\rho_i\}$. The state $\bar{\rho}=\sum_i\pi_i\rho_i$ is called the *average state* of the ensemble $\{\pi_i,\rho_i\}$.

The χ-quantity of an ensemble $\{\pi_i,\rho_i\}$ (providing an upper bound for accessible classical information which can be obtained by applying a quantum measurement) is defined as follows

$$\chi(\{\pi_i,\rho_i\})\doteq\sum_i\pi_i H(\rho_i\|\bar{\rho})=H(\bar{\rho})-\sum_i\pi_i H(\rho_i), \tag{3}$$

where the second formula is valid under the condition $H(\bar{\rho})<+\infty$ [5, 10].

A linear completely positive trace preserving map $\Phi:\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)\rightarrow\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is called *quantum channel* [5, 10]. The Stinespring theorem implies existence of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_E$ and of an isometry $V:\mathcal{H}_A\rightarrow\mathcal{H}_B\otimes\mathcal{H}_E$ such that

$$\Phi(\rho)=\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_E}V\rho V^*,\quad \rho\in\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A). \tag{4}$$

The quantum channel

$$\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)\ni\rho\mapsto\widehat{\Phi}(\rho)=\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}V\rho V^*\in\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_E) \tag{5}$$

is called *complementary* to the channel Φ [5, 6]. The complementary channel is defined uniquely: if $\widehat{\Phi}':\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)\rightarrow\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_{E'})$ is a channel defined by (5) via the Stinespring isometry $V':\mathcal{H}_A\rightarrow\mathcal{H}_B\otimes\mathcal{H}_{E'}$ then the channels $\widehat{\Phi}$ and $\widehat{\Phi}'$ are isometrically equivalent in the sense of the following definition [6].

Definition 1. Channels $\Phi:\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)\rightarrow\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ and $\Phi':\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)\rightarrow\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}'_B)$ are *isometrically equivalent* if there exists a partial isometry $W:\mathcal{H}_B\rightarrow\mathcal{H}_{B'}$ such that

$$\Phi'(\rho)=W\Phi(\rho)W^*,\quad \Phi(\rho)=W^*\Phi'(\rho)W,\quad \rho\in\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A).$$

Throughout the paper we will use the following notion.

Definition 2. The restriction of a channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ to the set $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_0)$, where $\mathcal{H}_0$ is a nontrivial subspace of $\mathcal{H}_A$, is called *subchannel of* Φ *corresponding to the subspace* $\mathcal{H}_0$.

By definition the complementary channel to the subchannel of an arbitrary channel Φ corresponding to any subspace $\mathcal{H}_0$ coincides with the subchannel of the complementary channel $\widehat{\Phi}$ corresponding to the subspace $\mathcal{H}_0$, i.e. $\widehat{\Psi} = \widehat{\Phi}|_{\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_0)}$, where $\Psi = \Phi|_{\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_0)}$.

The following class of quantum channels plays a basic role in this paper.

Definition 3. A channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is called *classical-quantum of discrete type* (briefly, *discrete c-q channel*) if it has the following representation

$$\Phi(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_A} \langle i|\rho|i\rangle \sigma_i, \quad \rho \in \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A), \tag{6}$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\{\sigma_i\}$ is a collection of states in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$.[1]

Discrete c-q channel (6) such that $\sigma_i = \sigma$ for all i is a *completely depolarizing* channel $\Phi(\rho) = [\mathrm{Tr}\rho]\sigma$. We will use the following obvious lemma.

Lemma 1. *A channel* $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ *is completely depolarizing if and only if* $\Phi(|\varphi\rangle\langle\psi|) = 0$ *for any orthogonal vectors* $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}_A$.

For given channel Φ and ensemble $\{\pi_i, \rho_i\}$ the χ-quantity of the ensemble $\{\pi_i, \Phi(\rho_i)\}$ will be denoted $\chi_\Phi(\{\pi_i, \rho_i\})$.

The constrained Holevo capacity of a channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ at a state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ is defined as follows

$$\bar{C}(\Phi, \rho) = \sup_{\sum_i \pi_i \rho_i = \rho} \chi_\Phi(\{\pi_i, \rho_i\}), \tag{7}$$

where the supremum is over all finite or countable ensembles $\{\pi_i, \rho_i\}$ with the average state ρ [5, 8].[2] If $H(\Phi(\rho)) < +\infty$ then

$$\bar{C}(\Phi, \rho) = H(\Phi(\rho)) - \hat{H}_\Phi(\rho), \tag{8}$$

---

[1] In infinite dimensions there exist c-q channels of non-discrete type [9, the Appendix].

[2] In [8, 15] the constrained Holevo capacity $\bar{C}(\Phi, \rho)$ is denoted $\chi_\Phi(\rho)$ and called the χ-function of the channel Φ.

where $\hat{H}_{\Phi}(\rho) = \inf_{\sum_i \pi_i \rho_i = \rho} \sum_i \pi_i H(\Phi(\rho_i))$ is the σ-convex hull of the function $\rho \mapsto H(\Phi(\rho))$. Note that the above supremum and infimum can be taken over ensembles of pure states.

Since monotonicity of the quantum relative entropy implies

$$\chi_{\Phi}(\{\pi_i, \rho_i\}) \leq \chi(\{\pi_i, \rho_i\}) \leq H(\rho)$$

for any ensemble $\{\pi_i, \rho_i\}$ with the average state ρ, the inequality

$$\bar{C}(\Phi, \rho) \leq H(\rho) \tag{9}$$

holds for an arbitrary quantum channel Φ and any state ρ.

The quantum mutual information of a finite-dimensional channel Φ at a state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ is defined by one of the formulas

$$I(\Phi, \rho) = H(\rho) + H(\Phi(\rho)) - H(\Phi, \rho) = H(\rho) + H(\Phi(\rho)) - H(\widehat{\Phi}(\rho)), \tag{10}$$

where $H(\Phi, \rho)$ is the entropy exchange of the channel Φ at the state ρ [1, 5].

In infinite dimensions this definition may contain uncertainty "$\infty - \infty$", but it can be modified to avoid this problem as follows

$$I(\Phi, \rho) = H\left(\Phi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{H}_R}(\hat{\rho}) \,\|\, \Phi \otimes \mathrm{Id}_{\mathcal{H}_R}(\rho \otimes \varrho)\right),$$

where $\mathcal{H}_R$ is a Hilbert space isomorphic to $\mathcal{H}_A$, $\hat{\rho}$ is a purification[3] of the state ρ in the space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$ and $\varrho = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_A} \hat{\rho}$ is a state in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_R)$ isomorphic to ρ [5].

A basic role in this paper is played by the expression

$$I(\Phi, \rho) = H(\rho) + \bar{C}(\Phi, \rho) - \bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi}, \rho) \tag{11}$$

valid for an arbitrary quantum channel Φ and any state ρ with finite entropy (the condition $H(\rho) < +\infty$ implies finiteness of all the terms in (11)). If $H(\Phi(\rho)) < +\infty$ and (hence) $H(\widehat{\Phi}(\rho)) < +\infty$ then this expression is easily proved by using (8) and by noting that $\hat{H}_{\Phi} \equiv \hat{H}_{\widehat{\Phi}}$ (this follows from coincidence of the functions $\rho \mapsto H(\Phi(\rho))$ and $\rho \mapsto H(\widehat{\Phi}(\rho))$ on the set of pure states). In general case expression (11) follows from Proposition 4 in [9].

---

[3] This means that $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}_R} \hat{\rho} = \rho$.

The constrained Holevo capacity and the quantum mutual information of an arbitrary channel Φ at any state ρ are connected by the inequality

$$\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho) \leq I(\Phi,\rho). \tag{12}$$

If $H(\rho) < +\infty$ then this inequality directly follows from (9) and (11). For an arbitrary state ρ it can be proved by using the sequence of finite rank states $\rho_n = [\mathrm{Tr} P_n\rho]^{-1}P_n\rho$, where P_n is the spectral projector of ρ corresponding to its n maximal eigenvalues. Concavity and lower semicontinuity of the functions $\rho \mapsto \bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)$ and $\rho \mapsto I(\Phi,\rho)$ imply respectively

$$\lim_n \bar{C}(\Phi,\rho_n) = \bar{C}(\Phi,\rho) \leq +\infty, \quad \lim_n I(\Phi,\rho_n) = I(\Phi,\rho) \leq +\infty. \tag{13}$$

Thus, validity of (12) for the state ρ follows from validity of (12) for each state of the sequence $\{\rho_n\}$.

Expression (11) shows that under the condition $H(\rho) < +\infty$ inequalities (9) and (12) are, roughly speaking, complementary to each other, in particular,

$$\{\, \bar{C}(\Phi,\rho) = I(\Phi,\rho) < +\infty \,\} \;\Leftrightarrow\; \{\, \bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho) = H(\rho) < +\infty \,\}. \tag{14}$$

and hence we may analyse conditions of equality in (12) by studying conditions of equality in (9).

Relation (14) implies the following result essentially used below.

Lemma 2. *Let $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ and $\Psi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_C)$ be quantum channels and ρ a state in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ such that $H(\rho) < +\infty$. Then*

$$\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho) = I(\Phi,\rho) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{C}(\Psi\circ\Phi,\rho) = I(\Psi\circ\Phi,\rho).$$

Proof. It follows from the proof of Lemma 17 in [3] that there exists a channel Θ such that $\widehat{\Phi} = \Theta \circ \widehat{\Psi\circ\Phi}$.[4] Hence the chain rule for the Holevo capacity and (9) show that

$$\bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho) = H(\rho) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{C}(\widehat{\Psi\circ\Phi},\rho) = H(\rho).$$

By (14) this implication is equivalent to the assertion of the lemma. $\square$

---

[4] This fact can be also shown easily by using the representation of a complementary channel via the Kraus operators of initial channel [6, formula (11)].

We will study the case of equality in (9) by using the concept of reversibility (sufficiency) of a quantum channel with respect to families of input states [11, 12, 13]. A channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is called reversible (sufficient) with respect to a family $\mathfrak{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ if there is a channel $\Psi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ such that $\rho = \Psi \circ \Phi(\rho)$ for all $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}$. The characterization of reversibility is obtained in [11] (by generalizing the results of [13]). We will use the following implication of this characterization.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ be a quantum channel and $\mathfrak{S} = \{\rho_i\}$ a family of states in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. Let $\{\pi_i\}$ be a non-degenerate probability distribution such that $\chi(\{\pi_i, \rho_i\}) < +\infty$. The channel Φ is reversible with respect to the family $\mathfrak{S}$ if and only if*

$$\chi_\Phi(\{\pi_i, \rho_i\}) = \chi(\{\pi_i, \rho_i\}).$$

For our purposes we will need a special case in which the family $\mathfrak{S}$ consists of pure states. Necessary and sufficient conditions for reversibility of a quantum channel with respect to families of pure states are considered in Section 3 in [17]. We will use the following implications of that results.

Theorem 2. *Let $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ be a quantum channel and $\mathfrak{S} = \{|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|\}$ a family of pure states in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$.*

A) *If the family $\mathfrak{S}$ consists of orthogonal states then the channel Φ is reversible with respect to the family $\mathfrak{S}$ if and only if*

$$\widehat{\Phi}(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{S}}} \langle\varphi_i|\rho|\varphi_i\rangle \sigma_i \quad \forall \rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{S}}),$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{S}}$ is the subspace of $\mathcal{H}_A$ generated by the family $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}$ and $\{\sigma_i\}$ is a collection of states in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$.

B) *Let $\mathfrak{S} = \bigcup_k \mathfrak{S}_k$ be a decomposition of $\mathfrak{S}$ into disjoint orthogonally non-decomposable subfamilies* [5] *and P_k the projector on the subspace generated by all the states in $\mathfrak{S}_k$. If the channel Φ is reversible with respect to the family $\mathfrak{S}$ then it is reversible with respect to the family*

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{S}} = \left\{ \rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A) \;\middle|\; \rho = \sum_k P_k \rho P_k \right\}.$$

---

[5] This means that $\rho \perp \sigma$ if $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ and $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_l$ for all $k \neq l$ and that for each k there is no subspace $\mathcal{H}_0$ such that some states (not all!) from $\mathfrak{S}_k$ lie in $\mathcal{H}_0$, while the others – in $\mathcal{H}_0^\perp$ [17].

Theorem 2 shows, in particular, that reversibility of a quantum channel with respect to at least one family of pure states is equivalent to existence of at least one discrete c-q subchannel of the complementary channel. A simple criterion of the last property is given by the following lemma (which can be proved similarly to Lemma 3 in [17]).

Lemma 3. *A channel* $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ *has a discrete c-q subchannel if and only if there exists an orthogonal family* $\{|i\rangle\}$ *of unit vectors in* $\mathcal{H}_A$ *such that* $\Phi(|i\rangle\langle j|) = 0$ *for all* $i \neq j$. *In this case the subchannel* $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_0)}$ *has representation (6) with* $\mathcal{H}_0 = \overline{\mathrm{lin}}\{|i\rangle\}$ *instead of* $\mathcal{H}_A$.

3 The main results

By using Theorem 1 and equivalence relation (14) it is shown in [15] that

$$\bar{C}(\Phi, \rho) = I(\Phi, \rho) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Phi|_{\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_\rho)} \text{ is a discrete c-q channel,}$$

for a finite-dimensional channel Φ, where $\mathcal{H}_\rho$ is the support of the state ρ. Theorem 2 makes it possible to strengthen this observation by showing that $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_\rho)}$ is a discrete c-q channel *determined by a particular basis of eigenvectors of the state* ρ [6] and to generalize it to infinite dimensions. As a result we obtain the following criterion of an equality in (12) for an infinite-dimensional channel Φ and a state ρ with finite von Neumann entropy.

Theorem 3. *Let* $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ *be a quantum channel and* $\Pi(\Phi)$ *the set of all orthogonal families* $\{|i\rangle\}$ *of unit vectors in* $\mathcal{H}_A$ *such that* $\Phi(|i\rangle\langle j|) = 0$ *for all* $i \neq j$.

A) *Let* ρ *be a mixed state in* $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ *such that* $H(\rho) < +\infty$. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $\bar{C}(\Phi, \rho) = I(\Phi, \rho)$;

(ii) *the set* $\Pi(\Phi)$ *contains at least one basis of eigenvectors of the state* ρ;

(iii) $\Phi(\varrho) = \sum_i \langle\varphi_i|\varrho|\varphi_i\rangle\sigma_i$ *for any* $\varrho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$, *where* $\mathcal{H}_\rho = \mathrm{supp}\rho$, $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}$ *is a particular orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of the state* ρ *and* $\{\sigma_i\}$ *is a collection of states in* $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$.

---

[6] Here and in what follows speaking about basis of eigenvectors of a state we mean a basis in the support of this state.

For a state ρ with infinite entropy the above statements are related as follows (ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) *(with possible infinite values of the both sides of the equality in* (i)*).*

B) *The set $\mathfrak{S}_{\Phi}^{=}$ of all mixed states ρ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ with finite entropy, for which* (i) *holds, can be represented as follows*

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\Phi}^{=} = \bigcup_{\{|i\rangle\}\in\Pi(\Phi)} \left\{ \rho = \sum_i \pi_i |i\rangle\langle i| \;\middle|\; \{\pi_i\} \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{f}} \right\}, \tag{15}$$

where $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{f}}$ is the set of probability distributions with finite Shannon entropy.

Remark 1. By Theorem 3B the set $\mathfrak{S}_{\Phi}^{=}$ is completely determined by the set $\ker\Phi$ (since the set $\Pi(\Phi)$ is defined via the set $\ker\Phi$). The example of a channel Φ, for which the set $\Pi(\Phi)$ contains infinitely many different non-complete families of vectors, is considered in the next section (where a description of the set $\Pi(\Phi)$ for Bosonic Gaussian channels is given).

Remark 2. The condition $H(\rho) < +\infty$ is essentially used in the proof of the implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii), (iii) (since it is based on relation (14)) and it is not clear how to relax it. On the other hand, this condition seems technical and one can conjecture that the assertions of Theorem 3 and of Corollary 1 below are also valid for states with infinite entropy.[7]

Proof. A) Note first that (ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) follows from Lemma 3.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i). By Theorem 2A (iii) implies reversibility of the channel $\widehat{\Phi}$ with respect to the family $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|\}$ which shows that $\bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho) = H(\rho)$. So, if $H(\rho) < +\infty$ then (i) follows from (14).

If $H(\rho) = +\infty$ then this reversibility implies $\bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho_n) = H(\rho_n)$ and hence $\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho_n) = I(\Phi,\rho_n)$, where $\rho_n = [\mathrm{Tr}P_n\rho]^{-1}P_n\rho$, $P_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n}|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$. Relations (13) show that $\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho) = I(\Phi,\rho) \le +\infty$.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) Here we prove this implication assuming that Φ is a finite-dimensional channel ($\dim\mathcal{H}_A, \dim\mathcal{H}_B < +\infty$). A general proof is based on the same idea but requires technical results (related to the notion of a generalized ensemble) and additional approximation, it is presented in the Appendix.

If Φ is a finite-dimensional channel then $\widehat{\Phi}$ is a finite-dimensional channel as well (cf.[6]) and hence for any state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ the supremum in the expression for $\bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho)$ (expression (7) with $\widehat{\Phi}$ instead of Φ) is achieved at a particular finite ensemble $\{\pi_i,\rho_i\}$ of pure states, i.e.

---

[7] I would be grateful for any comments concerning this question.

$$\bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho)=\chi_{\widehat{\Phi}}(\{\pi_i,\rho_i\}),\quad \sum_i \pi_i\rho_i=\rho$$

(existence of such ensemble can be proved by using the arguments from [14]).

If (i) holds then (14) implies $\bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho)=H(\rho)=\chi(\{\pi_i,\rho_i\})$ and hence $\chi_{\widehat{\Phi}}(\{\pi_i,\rho_i\})=\chi(\{\pi_i,\rho_i\})$. By Theorem 1 this is equivalent to reversibility of the channel $\widehat{\Phi}$ with respect to the family $\mathfrak{S}=\{\rho_i\}$. Let $\mathfrak{S}=\bigcup_k\mathfrak{S}_k$ be a decomposition of $\mathfrak{S}$ into disjoint non-orthogonally-decomposable subfamilies (see Theorem 2B). Denote by I_k the set of all indexes i such that $\rho_i\in\mathfrak{S}_k$. Let $\{|\varphi^i_k\rangle\}_i$ be an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of the positive operator $\rho_k=\sum_{i\in I_k}\pi_i\rho_i$. Since $\rho=\sum_k\rho_k$ and $\mathrm{supp}\rho_k\perp\mathrm{supp}\rho_l$ for all $k\neq l$, $\{|\varphi^i_k\rangle\}_{ik}$ is an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of the state ρ.

By Theorem 2B the reversibility of the channel $\widehat{\Phi}$ with respect to the family $\mathfrak{S}$ implies reversibility of this channel with respect to the orthogonal family $\{|\varphi^i_k\rangle\langle\varphi^i_k|\}_{ik}$ (since the last family is contained in the family $\widehat{\mathfrak{S}}$). Since the channels Φ and $\widehat{\widehat{\Phi}}$ are isometrically equivalent (see Definition 1), Theorem 2A implies (iii).

B) Representation (15) directly follows from the first part of the theorem. $\square$

Theorem 3 implies sufficient conditions for a strict inequality in (12).

Corollary 1. *Let $\Phi:\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)\to\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ be a quantum channel.*

A) *If Φ is not a discrete c-q channel then $\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)<I(\Phi,\rho)$ for any non-degenerate state ρ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ with finite entropy.*

B) *If the set $\ker\Phi$ contains no 1-rank operators then $\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)<I(\Phi,\rho)$ for any mixed state ρ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ with finite entropy.*

The examples of a channel for which the condition of Corollary 1B holds are considered in the next section (Proposition 1 and Example 1).

Now we turn to a condition of global equality in (12) and prove the strengthened version of the conjecture stated in [15].

Corollary 2. *If $\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)=I(\Phi,\rho)$ for any 2-rank state ρ then Φ is a completely depolarizing channel and hence $\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)=I(\Phi,\rho)=0$ for any state ρ.*

Remark 3. Corollary 2 shows that for any nontrivial channel Φ the concave nonnegative functions $\rho\mapsto\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)$ and $\rho\mapsto I(\Phi,\rho)$ (equal to zero on the set of 1-rank states) are always separated by a particular 2-rank state.

Proof. By Lemma 1 it suffices to show that $\Phi(|\varphi\rangle\langle\psi|)=0$ for any orthogonal unit vectors $\varphi,\psi\in\mathcal{H}_A$.

Let $\rho=0.3|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|+0.7|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ be a 2-rank state in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. By the condition $\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)=I(\Phi,\rho)$ and Theorem 3 implies $\Phi(|\varphi\rangle\langle\psi|)=0$ (since $\{|\varphi\rangle,|\psi\rangle\}$ is the only basis of eigenvectors of the state ρ). $\square$

As shown in [15] for a finite-dimensional channel $\Phi:\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)\rightarrow\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ the following relation holds

$$D(\Phi)\doteq\max_{\rho\in\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)}\left[\,I(\Phi,\rho)-\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)\,\right]=\sup_{H,h}\left[\,C_{\mathrm{ea}}(\Phi,H,h)-\bar{C}(\Phi,H,h)\,\right],$$

where $C_{\mathrm{ea}}(\Phi,H,h)$ and $\bar{C}(\Phi,H,h)$ are respectively the entanglement-assisted capacity and the Holevo capacity of the channel Φ with the linear constraint determined by inequality $\mathrm{Tr}H\rho\leq h$ and the supremum is taken over all pairs (positive operator H, positive number h). Corollary 2 implies that $D(\Phi)>0$ if Φ is not completely depolarizing. This completes the proof of the following list of properties of the parameter $D(\Phi)$ (showing that it can be considered as one of characteristics of the channel Φ describing its "level of noise"):

- $D(\Psi\circ\Phi)\leq D(\Phi)$ for any channel $\Psi:\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)\rightarrow\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_C)$;
- $D(\Phi)\in[0,\log\dim\mathcal{H}_A]$;
- $D(\Phi)=\log\dim\mathcal{H}_A$ if and only if Φ is a noiseless channel (i.e. Φ is unitary equivalent to the channel $\rho\mapsto\rho\otimes\sigma$, where σ is a given state);
- $D(\Phi)=0$ if and only if Φ is a completely depolarizing channel.

4 Applications to Bosonic Gaussian channels

Consider application of Theorem 3 to Bosonic Gaussian channels playing a central role in infinite-dimensional quantum information theory [4, 5].

Let $\mathcal{H}_X$ $(X=A,B,...)$ be the space of irreducible representation of the Canonical Commutation Relations (CCR)

$$W_X(z)W_X(z')=\exp\left(-\frac{i}{2}z^{\top}\Delta_X z'\right)W_X(z'+z)$$

with a symplectic space (Z_X, Δ_X) and the Weyl operators $W_X(z)$ [5, Ch.12]. Denote by s_X the number of modes of the system X, i.e. $2s_X = \dim Z_X$.

A Bosonic Gaussian channel $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is defined via the action of its dual $\Phi^* : \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B) \to \mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ on the Weyl operators:

$$\Phi^*(W_B(z)) = W_A(Kz) \exp\left[il^\top z - \tfrac{1}{2} z^\top \alpha z\right], \quad z \in Z_B, \tag{16}$$

where K is a linear operator $Z_B \to Z_A$, l is a $2s_B$-dimensional real row and α is a real symmetric $(2s_B) \times (2s_B)$ matrix satisfying the inequality

$$\alpha \geq \pm \frac{i}{2}\left[\Delta_B - K^\top \Delta_A K\right]. \tag{17}$$

By applying replacement unitary transformations an arbitrary Gaussian channel can be transformed to the Gaussian channel with $l = 0$ and the same matrices K and α (such channel is called *centered* and will be denoted $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$). So, in study of relations between the constrained Holevo capacity and the quantum mutual information we may (and will) assume that **all Gaussian channels are centered**.

It follows from Proposition 5 in [9] and Proposition 3 in [17] that:

- $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ is a discrete c-q channel if and only if $K = 0$ (i.e. $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ is completely depolarizing);
- $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ has discrete c-q subchannels if and only if $\mathrm{Ran}K \neq Z_A$ (i.e. $\mathrm{rank}K < \dim Z_A$).

Let $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ be a nontrivial Gaussian channel ($K \neq 0$). By the above observations Theorem 3 shows that the strict inequality $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) < I(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho)$ is valid for any non-degenerate state ρ with finite entropy while existence of mixed degenerate states, for which an equality holds in this inequality, is possible only if $\mathrm{Ran}K \neq Z_A$. This condition holds in the following two cases:

A) $[\mathrm{Ran}K]^\perp$ is a nontrivial isotropic subspace of Z_A; [8]

B) $[\mathrm{Ran}K]^\perp$ contains a nontrivial symplectic subspace.

---

[8] $[\mathrm{Ran}K]^\perp$ is the skew-orthogonal complementary subspace to the subspace $\mathrm{Ran}K$ of Z_A. We will use this sense of the symbol " $\perp$ " dealing with a subspace of a symplectic space.

By Proposition 3 in [17] Gaussian channels corresponding to case B are characterized by existence of completely depolarizing subchannels. The proof of Proposition 1 below shows that any such channel can be represented as a partial trace over some input modes followed by a Gaussian channel which either corresponds to case A or satisfies the condition "Ran$K = Z_A$". So, we will focus attention on case A and will find all mixed states ρ with finite entropy such that $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) = I(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho)$ by describing the set $\Pi(\Phi_{K,\alpha})$ (introduced in Theorem 3) in the Schrodinger representation.

Since the family $\{W_B(z)\}_{z\in Z_B}$ generates $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, it follows from definition (16) of the channel $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ that $\Phi_{K,\alpha}(|\varphi\rangle\langle\psi|) = 0$ for vectors $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}_A$ if and only if $\langle\varphi|W_A(Kz)|\psi\rangle = 0$ for all $z \in Z_B$. So, the set $\Pi(\Phi_{K,\alpha})$ consists of all orthonormal families $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\} \subset \mathcal{H}_A$ such that

$$\langle\varphi_i|W_A(Kz)|\varphi_j\rangle = 0 \quad \forall z \in Z_B,\ \forall i \neq j. \tag{18}$$

In case A Lemma 6 in [17, Appendix 6.2] implies existence of a symplectic basis $\{\tilde{e}_k, \tilde{h}_k\}$ in Z_A such that $\{\tilde{e}_1, ..., \tilde{e}_{s_A}, \tilde{h}_{d+1}, ..., \tilde{h}_{s_A}\}$ is a basis in Ran$K$, $d \leq s_A$. Let Z_B^0 be a subspace of Z_B with the basis $\{z_1^e, ..., z_{s_A}^e, z_{d+1}^h, ..., z_{s_A}^h\}$ such that $\tilde{e}_k = Kz_k^e$ for all $k = \overline{1, s_A}$ and $\tilde{h}_k = Kz_k^h$ for all $k = \overline{d+1, s_A}$. Thus for any vector $z \in Z_B^0$ represented as $z = \sum_{k=1}^{s_A} x_k z_k^e + \sum_{k=d+1}^{s_A} y_k z_k^h$, $(x_1, ..., x_{s_A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{s_A}$, $(y_{d+1}, ..., y_{s_A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{s_A - d}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_A(Kz) &= W_A\left(\sum_{k=1}^{s_A} x_k\tilde{e}_k + \sum_{k=d+1}^{s_A} y_k\tilde{h}_k\right) \\ &= \lambda W_A(x_1\tilde{e}_1) \cdot ... \cdot W_A(x_{s_A}\tilde{e}_{s_A}) \cdot W_A(y_{d+1}\tilde{h}_{d+1}) \cdot ... \cdot W_A(y_{s_A}\tilde{h}_{s_A}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda = e^{i[x_{d+1}y_{d+1}+...+x_{s_A}y_{s_A}]} \neq 0$.

By identifying the space $\mathcal{H}_A$ with the space $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{s_A})$ of complex-valued functions of s_A variables (which will be denoted $\xi_1, ..., \xi_{s_A}$) and the Weyl operators $W_A(\tilde{e}_k)$ and $W_A(\tilde{h}_k)$ with the operators

$$\psi(\xi_1, ..., \xi_{s_A}) \mapsto e^{i\xi_k}\psi(\xi_1, ..., \xi_{s_A}) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(\xi_1, ..., \xi_{s_A}) \mapsto \psi(\xi_1, ..., \xi_k + 1, ..., \xi_{s_A})$$

the equality in (18) for the vector z can be written as follows

$$\int \overline{\varphi_i(\xi_1, ..., \xi_{s_A})}(S_{y_{d+1},...,y_{s_A}}\varphi_j)(\xi_1, ..., \xi_{s_A})e^{i(x_1\xi_1+...+x_{s_A}\xi_{s_A})}d\xi_1, ..., d\xi_{s_A} = 0,$$

where $(S_{y_{d+1},...,y_{s_A}}\varphi_j)(\xi_1,...,\xi_{s_A}) = \varphi_j(\xi_1,...,\xi_d,\xi_{d+1}+y_{d+1},...,\xi_{s_A}+y_{s_A})$.

This equality holds for all $(x_1,...,x_{s_A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{s_A}$ and $(y_{d+1},...,y_{s_A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{s_A-d}$ (that is for all $z \in Z_B^0$) if and only if

$$\overline{\varphi_i(\xi_1,...,\xi_{s_A})}(S_{y_{d+1},...,y_{s_A}}\varphi_j)(\xi_1,...,\xi_{s_A}) = 0$$

for almost all $(\xi_1,...,\xi_{s_A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{s_A}$ and all $(y_{d+1},...,y_{s_A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{s_A-d}$. Since $\mathrm{Ran}K = K(Z_B^0)$, this means that condition (18) is valid if and only if

$$\varphi_i \cdot S_{y_{d+1},...,y_{s_A}}\varphi_j = 0 \ \ (\text{in } L_2(\mathbb{R}^{s_A})) \quad \forall (y_{d+1},...,y_{s_A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{s_A-d},\ \forall i \neq j. \tag{19}$$

where $S_{y_{d+1},...,y_{s_A}}$ is a shift operator along the last $s_A - d$ coordinates:

$$(S_{y_{d+1},...,y_{s_A}}\psi)(\xi_1,...,\xi_{s_A}) = \psi(\xi_1,...,\xi_d,\xi_{d+1}+y_{d+1},...,\xi_{s_A}+y_{s_A}).$$

Condition (19) means, roughly speaking, that all shifts in $\mathbb{R}^{s_A}$ of the supports of all functions of the family $\{\varphi_i\}$ along the last $s_A - d$ coordinates do not intersect each other.

Remark 4. Condition (19) is completely determined by the subspace $\mathrm{Ran}K$. We will say that *a family $\{\varphi_i\}$ of functions satisfies condition (19) determined by a subspace Z_0 of Z_A* (such that $[Z_0]^\perp$ is isotropic) if it satisfies analog of (19) constructed by using Z_0 instead of $\mathrm{Ran}K$. $\square$

Thus, in the Schrodinger representation the set $\Pi(\Phi_{K,\alpha})$ consists of all orthogonal families $\{\varphi_i\}$ of functions in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{s_A})$ with unit norm satisfying condition (19). So, by Theorem 3A, the equality $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha},\rho) = I(\Phi_{K,\alpha},\rho)$ holds for a mixed state ρ with finite entropy if and only if this state ρ has a basis of eigenvectors $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}$ which (in the Schrodinger representation) satisfies condition (19). Theorem 3A also implies that the "if" part of this assertion is valid for a state ρ with infinite entropy.

By using these observations and by noting that a basis of eigenvectors of any mixed Gaussian state can not satisfy condition (19) we obtain the following assertions.

Proposition 1. *Let $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{f}}$ be the subset of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ consisting of all states with finite von Neumann entropy.*

A) *If $K \neq 0$ (i.e. $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ is not completely depolarizing) then*

$$\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha},\rho) < I(\Phi_{K,\alpha},\rho) \tag{20}$$

for any non-degenerate state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{f}}$, in particular, for any non-degenerate Gaussian state ρ.

B) *If $\mathrm{Ran}K = Z_A$ then (20) holds for any mixed state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{f}}$.*

C) *If* $[\mathrm{Ran}K]^{\perp}$ *is a nontrivial isotropic subspace of* Z_A *then*

- *inequality (20) holds for any mixed Gaussian state* ρ *and for a mixed state* $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{f}}$ *having no basis of eigenvectors satisfying condition (19);*
- $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) = I(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho)$ *for a mixed state* $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ *which has basis of eigenvectors satisfying condition (19).*

D) *If* $[\mathrm{Ran}K]^{\perp}$ *contains a nontrivial symplectic subspace then there exist mixed Gaussian states* ρ *such that* $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) = I(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho)$*.*[9]

Proof. We have to prove only the last assertion.

If there exists a nontrivial symplectic subspace Z_{A_0} of $[\mathrm{Ran}K]^{\perp}$ then $Z_A = Z_{A_0} \oplus Z_{A_*}$, where $Z_{A_*} = [Z_{A_0}]^{\perp}$, and hence $\mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}_{A_0} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_*}$. By using the concatenation rules for Gaussian channels (see [5, Ch.12]) it is easy to show that $\Phi_{K,\alpha} = \Phi_{K',\alpha} \circ \Psi$, where Ψ is the partial trace in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ over the space $\mathcal{H}_{A_0}$ and $\Phi_{K',\alpha}$ is the Gaussian channel from $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_{A_*})$ to $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ determined by the "output restriction" K' of the operator K and the same matrix α. It follows that for any pure Gaussian state $\rho_* = |\psi_*\rangle\langle\psi_*|$ in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_{A_*})$ the subchannel of $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ corresponding to the subspace $\mathcal{H}_{A_0} \otimes \{\lambda|\psi_*\rangle\}$ is completely depolarizing. Hence $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho_0 \otimes \rho_*) = I(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho_0 \otimes \rho_*) = 0$ for any Gaussian state ρ_0 in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_{A_0})$. $\square$

Example 1. Applying Proposition 1 to one-mode Gaussian channels ($s_A = s_B = 1$) we see that for all such channels excepting channels of types A_1 and A_2 (in Holevo's classification [7]) strict inequality (20) holds for all mixed states with finite entropy.

Type A_1 corresponds to completely depolarizing channels. So, channels of type A_2 are the only non-trivial one mode Gaussian channels for which strict equality (20) is not valid for all mixed states.

One-mode Gaussian channel of type A_2 is a non-discrete c-q channel, its canonical representative $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ is determined by the parameters

$$K = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array}\right], \quad \alpha = \left[\begin{array}{cc} N_0 + \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & N_0 + \frac{1}{2} \end{array}\right], \quad N_0 \geq 0.$$

---

[9] It is precisely case D in which the channel $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ has completely depolarizing subchannels [17, Proposition 3]. Similar to case C in this case is also possible, by using the Schrodinger representation, to obtain an analogue of condition (19) describing all states $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{f}}$ for which $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) = I(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho)$.

This channel satisfies the condition of part C of Proposition 1. In this case the basis $\{\tilde{e}_k, \tilde{h}_k\}$ introduced in deriving condition (19) consists of the vectors $\tilde{e}_1 = [1,0]^{\mathrm{T}}$, $\tilde{h}_1 = [0,1]^{\mathrm{T}}$ and $\mathrm{Ran}K = \{\lambda\tilde{e}_1\}$. So, in the corresponding Schrodinger representation (in which $\mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}_B = L_2(\mathbb{R})$) condition (19) is written as follows

$$\varphi_i(\xi)\varphi_j(\xi) = 0 \text{ almost everywhere in } \mathbb{R} \text{ for all } i \neq j. \tag{21}$$

By Proposition 1C, $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) = I(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho)$ for any state in

$$\bigcup_{\{\varphi_i\}\in\Pi(\Phi_{K,\alpha})} \left\{ \rho = \sum_i \pi_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i| \;\middle|\; \{\pi_i\} \text{ is a probability distribution} \right\}, \tag{22}$$

where $\Pi(\Phi_{K,\alpha})$ is the set of all families $\{\varphi_i(\xi)\}$ of functions in $L_2(\mathbb{R})$ with unit norm satisfying condition (21). An example of such family can be constructed by taking a decomposition $\{D_i\}$ of $\mathbb{R}$ into disjoint measurable subsets and by choosing for each i a function $\varphi_i(\xi)$ with unit norm vanishing in $\mathbb{R} \setminus D_i$.

Proposition 1C also shows that $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) < I(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho)$ for any mixed Gaussian state ρ and for any state ρ with finite entropy not lying in set (22).

5 On the "complementary" inequality

It follows from (14) that conditions for equality in (12) can be reformulated as conditions for equality in (9) via the notion of a complementary channel. We focused attention on the former conditions, since they are more important for applications, while the latter were used in the proofs as a "bridge" to reversibility properties of a channel.

Theorem 3 is reformulated as follows.

Theorem 4. *Let* $\Phi : \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ *be a quantum channel and* $\widehat{\Pi}(\Phi)$ *the set of all orthogonal families* $\{|i\rangle\}$ *of unit vectors in* $\mathcal{H}_A$ *such that* $\mathrm{supp}\Phi(|i\rangle\langle i|) \perp \mathrm{supp}\Phi(|j\rangle\langle j|)$ *for all* $i \neq j$.

A) *Let* ρ *be a mixed state in* $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ *such that* $H(\rho) < +\infty$. *The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) $\bar{C}(\Phi, \rho) = H(\rho)$;

(ii) *the set* $\widehat{\Pi}(\Phi)$ *contains at least one basis of eigenvectors of the state* ρ;

(iii) $\Phi|_{\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_\rho)}$ *is isometrically equivalent (see Definition 1) to the channel*

$$\varrho \mapsto \sum_{i,\,j=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_\rho} \langle\varphi_i|\varrho|\varphi_j\rangle |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_j| \otimes \sum_{k,\,l=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_B} \langle\psi_{jl}|\psi_{ik}\rangle |k\rangle\langle l|$$

from $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_\rho)$ *into* $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}_B)$*, where* $\mathcal{H}_\rho = \mathrm{supp}\rho$*,* $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}$ *is a particular orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of the state* ρ*,* $\{|\psi_{ik}\rangle\}$ *is a collection of vectors in a Hilbert space such that* $\sum_{k=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_B} \|\psi_{ik}\|^2 = 1$ *for all* i *and* $\{|k\rangle\}$ *is an orthonormal basis in* $\mathcal{H}_B$*.*

For a state ρ *with infinite entropy the above statements are related as follows* (ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i)*.*

B) *The set* $\widehat{\mathfrak{S}}_{\Phi}^{=}$ *of all mixed states* ρ *in* $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ *with finite entropy, for which* (i) *holds, can be represented as follows*

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{S}}_{\Phi}^{=} \;=\; \bigcup_{\{|i\rangle\}\in\widehat{\Pi}(\Phi)} \left\{ \rho = \sum_i \pi_i |i\rangle\langle i| \;\middle|\; \{\pi_i\}\in\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{f}} \right\},$$

where $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{f}}$ *is the set of probability distributions with finite Shannon entropy.*

Proof. By using the standard representation of a complementary channel (formula (11) in [6]) and by noting that

$$\mathrm{supp}\Phi(|i\rangle\langle i|) \perp \mathrm{supp}\Phi(|j\rangle\langle j|) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \widehat{\Phi}(|i\rangle\langle j|) = 0$$

for any vectors $|i\rangle$ and $|j\rangle$ it is easy to show that statements (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 4 are equivalent respectively to statements (ii) and (iii) in Theorem 3 for the channel $\widehat{\Phi}$. $\square$

Since a completely depolarizing channel is complementary to a noiseless (perfectly reversible) channel and vice versa [5, Ch.10], Corollary 2 is reformulated as follows.

Corollary 3. *If* $\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho) = H(\rho)$ *for any 2-rank state* ρ *then* Φ *is a noiseless channel, i.e.* Φ *is unitary equivalent to the channel* $\rho\mapsto\rho\otimes\sigma$*, where* σ *is a given state.*

It is well known that the complementary channel to an arbitrary Gaussian channel is also Gaussian [2, 5]. So, we may assume that $\Phi_{K,\alpha} = \widehat{\Phi}_{L,\beta}$, where L is a linear operator $Z_E \to Z_A$ and β is a real symmetric $(2s_E)\times(2s_E)$

matrix (satisfying the inequality similar to (17)). It follows from Lemma 2 in [17] that

$$[\mathrm{Ran}L]^{\perp} = K(\ker\alpha) \tag{23}$$

and that the restriction the operator K to the subspace $\ker\alpha$ is non-degenerate and symplectic, i.e. it preserves the corresponding skew-symmetrical forms Δ_X, $X = A, B$. So, we have

$$\{L = 0\} \Leftrightarrow \{\Phi_{K,\alpha} \text{ is a noiseless channel}\}, \quad \{\mathrm{Ran}L = Z_A\} \Leftrightarrow \{\det\alpha \neq 0\},$$

$$\{\text{the subspace } [\mathrm{Ran}L]^{\perp} \text{ is isotropic}\} \Leftrightarrow \{\text{the subspace } \ker\alpha \text{ is isotropic}\}.$$

Hence, by noting that $\mathrm{Ran}L = [\mathrm{Ran}L]^{\perp\perp} = [K(\ker\alpha)]^{\perp}$ one can reformulate Proposition 1 as follows.

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{f}}$ be the subset of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ consisting of all states with finite von Neumann entropy.*

A) *If $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ is not a noiseless channel then*

$$\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) < H(\rho) \tag{24}$$

for any non-degenerate state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{f}}$, in particular, for any non-degenerate Gaussian state ρ.

B) *If $\det\alpha \neq 0$ then (24) holds for any mixed state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{f}}$.*

C) *If $\ker\alpha$ is a nontrivial isotropic subspace of Z_B then*

- *inequality (24) holds for any mixed Gaussian state ρ and for a mixed state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathrm{f}}$ having no basis of eigenvectors which satisfies condition (19) determined by the subspace $[K(\ker\alpha)]^{\perp}$ (see Remark 4);*

- *$\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) = H(\rho)$ for a mixed state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ having basis of eigenvectors which satisfies condition (19) determined by the subspace $[K(\ker\alpha)]^{\perp}$.*

D) *If $\ker\alpha$ contains a nontrivial symplectic subspace then there exist mixed Gaussian states ρ such that $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha}, \rho) = H(\rho)$.*

Example 2. Proposition 2B shows that for all one-mode Gaussian channels excepting noiseless channels and channels of type B_1 (in Holevo's classification [7]) strict inequality (24) holds for all mixed states with finite entropy.

The canonical one-mode Gaussian channel $\Phi_{K,\alpha}$ of type B_1 is determined by the parameters

$$K=\left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{array}\right], \quad \alpha=\left[\begin{array}{cc} \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array}\right].$$

In the Schrodinger representation (in which $\mathcal{H}_A=\mathcal{H}_B=L_2(\mathbb{R})$) condition (19) determined by the subspace $[K(\ker\alpha)]^{\perp}=\{[\,\lambda,0\,]^{\mathrm{T}}\}$ coincides with condition (21).[10]

Hence, Proposition 2C shows that $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha},\rho)=H(\rho)$ for any state in set (22) and that $\bar{C}(\Phi_{K,\alpha},\rho)<H(\rho)$ for any mixed Gaussian state ρ and for any state ρ with finite entropy not lying in set (22).

Appendix: The proof of Theorem 3 in infinite-dimensions

The proof of the implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) in Theorem 3 given in Section 3 is not directly generalized to the infinite-dimensional case because of possible nonexistence of an ensemble $\{\pi_i,\rho_i\}$ with average state ρ such that $\bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi},\rho)=\chi_{\widehat{\Phi}}(\{\pi_i,\rho_i\})$. This problem can be overcome by using the notion of a generalized (continuous) ensemble.

Following [8] consider an arbitrary Borel probability measure μ on the set $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ as an input generalized ensemble for a channel $\Phi:\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)\to\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ and define its output χ-quantity as follows

$$\chi_{\Phi}(\mu)=\int_{\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)}H(\Phi(\rho)\|\Phi(\bar{\rho}(\mu)))\mu(d\rho)=H(\Phi(\bar{\rho}(\mu)))-\int_{\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)}H(\Phi(\rho))\mu(d\rho),$$

where $\bar{\rho}(\mu)=\int_{\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)}\rho\mu(d\rho)$ is the barycenter of the measure μ and the second formula is valid under the condition $H(\Phi(\bar{\rho}(\mu)))<+\infty$.

Denote by $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A))$ the set of all Borel probability measures on the set $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ supported by pure states. It follows from Corollary 1 in [8] that

$$\bar{C}(\Phi,\rho)=\sup_{\bar{\rho}(\mu)=\rho}\chi_{\Phi}(\mu), \tag{25}$$

---

[10] This is not surprising and follows from (23), since the channel of type A_2 with $N_0=0$ is complementary to the channel of type B_1 [5, Ch.12].

where the supremum is over all measures in $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A))$ with the barycenter ρ.

In contrast to the finite-dimensional case, the supremum in (25) is not attainable in general, but there exist sufficient conditions for its attainability, the simplest of them is the following: $H(\Phi(\rho)) < +\infty$ [8, Corollary 2].

Now we are in a position to prove the implication (i) $\Rightarrow$ (iii).

Assume first that $H(\Phi(\rho)) < +\infty$. This and the condition $H(\rho) < +\infty$ imply $H(\widehat{\Phi}(\rho)) < +\infty$ (by the triangle inequality). By Corollary 2 in [8] there exists a measure μ in $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_A))$ with the barycenter ρ such that

$$\bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi}, \rho) = \chi_{\widehat{\Phi}}(\mu).$$

If (i) holds then (14) implies $\bar{C}(\widehat{\Phi}, \rho) = H(\rho) = \chi(\mu)$ and hence $\chi_{\widehat{\Phi}}(\mu) = \chi(\mu)$. By Proposition 1 in [16] (in which a generalization of Theorem 1 to continuous ensembles is established) this is equivalent to reversibility of the channel $\widehat{\Phi}$ with respect to a family $\mathfrak{S}$ of pure states such that $\mu(\mathfrak{S}) = 1$. Let $\mathfrak{S} = \bigcup_k \mathfrak{S}_k$ be a decomposition of $\mathfrak{S}$ into disjoint non-orthogonally-decomposable subfamilies and $\{|\varphi_k^i\rangle\}_i$ an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of the positive operator $\rho_k = \int_{\mathfrak{S}_k} \rho\mu(\rho)$. Since $\rho = \sum_k \rho_k$ and $\mathrm{supp}\rho_k \perp \mathrm{supp}\rho_l$ for all $k \neq l$, $\{|\varphi_k^i\rangle\}_{ik}$ is an orthonormal basis of eigenvectors of the state ρ.

The same arguments as in the finite-dimensional case based on Theorem 2 show validity of (iii) with the basis $\{|\varphi_k^i\rangle\}_{ik}$.

If $H(\Phi(\rho)) = +\infty$ then we can choose an increasing sequence $\{P_n\}$ of finite-rank projectors in $\mathcal{H}_B$ strongly converging to $I_{\mathcal{H}_B}$ and consider the sequence $\{\Phi_n \doteq \Pi_n \circ \Phi\}$ of channels from $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ into $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$, where $\Pi_n(\sigma) = P_n\sigma P_n + [\mathrm{Tr}(I_{\mathcal{H}_B} - P_n)\sigma]\tau$ is a channel from $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ into itself, τ is a given pure state in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$. By Lemma 2 (i) implies

$$\bar{C}(\Phi_n, \rho) = I(\Phi_n, \rho)$$

for each n. Since $H(\Phi_n(\rho)) < +\infty$, it follows from the previous part of the proof that (iii) and hence (ii) hold for the channel Φ_n for each n, i.e.

$$\Phi_n(|\varphi_i^n\rangle\langle\varphi_j^n|) = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j \ \forall n, \tag{26}$$

where $\{|\varphi_i^n\rangle\}$ is a basis of eigenvectors of the state ρ (depending on n).

If the state ρ has no multiple eigenvalues then it has the only (up to permutation and scalar multiplication) basis of eigenvectors $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}$ and (26) implies

$$\Phi(|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_j|) = \lim_n \Phi_n(|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_j|) = 0 \quad \forall i \neq j,$$

i.e. validity of (ii) for the channel Φ.

If the state ρ has multiple eigenvalues then the required basis $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}$ can be we constructed as follows.

For natural m let $\mathcal{H}_m$ be the direct sum of the eigen-subspaces of the state ρ corresponding to its m maximal eigenvalues. Let $d_m = \dim \mathcal{H}_m$. We may consider that the vectors $|\varphi^n_1\rangle, \dots |\varphi^n_{d_m}\rangle$ of the above basis $\{|\varphi^n_i\rangle\}$ belong to the subspace $\mathcal{H}_m$ for each n.

Let n^1_k be a sequence of natural numbers such that there exist

$$\lim_k |\varphi_i^{n^1_k}\rangle = |\varphi^1_i\rangle, \quad i = \overline{1, d_1},$$

(existence of this sequence and of the below subsequences follows from compactness of the unit ball of the subspace $\mathcal{H}_m$ for each m).

For $m > 1$ let n^m_k be a subsequence of n^{m-1}_k such that there exist

$$\lim_k |\varphi_i^{n^m_k}\rangle = |\varphi^m_i\rangle, \quad i = \overline{1, d_m}.$$

It follows from (26) that

$$\Phi(|\varphi^m_i\rangle\langle\varphi^m_j|) = \lim_k \Phi_{n^m_k}(|\varphi_i^{n^m_k}\rangle\langle\varphi_j^{n^m_k}|) = 0 \tag{27}$$

for all $i \neq j$ not exceeding d_m.

By construction $|\varphi^m_i\rangle = |\varphi^{m-1}_i\rangle$ for $i = \overline{1, d_{m-1}}$. So, we have the increasing sequence

$$\{|\varphi^1_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d_1} \subset \{|\varphi^2_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d_2} \subset \ldots \subset \{|\varphi^m_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d_m} \cdots$$

of orthonormal sets of eigenvectors of the state ρ such that $\{|\varphi^m_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d_m}$ is a basis in the subspace $\mathcal{H}_m$ for which (27) holds.

It is clear that the union $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{+\infty}$ of all the sets of this sequence is a basis of eigenvectors of the state ρ such that $\Phi(|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_j|) = 0$ for all $i \neq j$. $\square$

I am grateful to A.S.Holevo and to the participants of his seminar "Quantum probability, statistic, information" (the Steklov Mathematical Institute) for useful discussion.

References

[1] C.Adami, N.J.Cerf "Von Neumann capacity of noisy quantum channels", Phys.Rev. A, V.56, N.5, P.3470-3483, 1997.

[2] F.Caruso, J.Eisert, V.Giovannetti, A.S.Holevo "Multi-mode bosonic Gaussian channels", New Journal of Physics 10, 083030, 2008; arXiv:0804.0511.

[3] T.S.Cubitt, M.B.Ruskai, G.Smith "The structure of degradable quantum channels", J. Math. Phys., V.49, 102104, 2008; arXiv:0802.1360.

[4] J.Eisert, M.M.Wolf "Gaussian quantum channels", Quantum Information with Continuous Variables of Atoms and Light, P.23-42 (Imperial College Press, London, 2007); arXiv:quant-ph/0505151.

[5] A.S.Holevo "Quantum systems, channels, information. A mathematical introduction", Berlin, DeGruyter, 2012.

[6] A.S.Holevo "On complementary channels and the additivity problem", Probability Theory and Applications. 2006. V.51. N.1. P.134-143; arXiv:quant-ph/0509101.

[7] A.S.Holevo "One-mode quantum Gaussian channels: structure and quantum capacity", Problems of Information Transmission. 2007. V.43. N.1. P.3-14; arXiv:quant-ph/0607051.

[8] A.S.Holevo, M.E.Shirokov "Continuous ensembles and the χ-capacity of infinite-dimensional channels", Theory of Probability and its Applications, V.50, N.1, P.86-98, 2005; arXiv:quant-ph/0408176.

[9] A.S.Holevo, M.E.Shirokov "On the entanglement-assisted classical capacity of infinite-dimensional quantum channels", arXiv:1210.6926.

[10] M.A.Nielsen, I.L.Chuang "Quantum Computation and Quantum Information", Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[11] A.Jencova, D.Petz "Sufficiency in quantum statistical inference", Commun. Math. Phys. 263, P.259-276, 2006; arXiv:math-ph/0412093.

[12] A.Jencova "Reversibility conditions for quantum operations", arXiv:1107.0453.

[13] D.Petz "Sufficiency of channels over von Neumann algebras", Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) V.39, N.153, P.97-108, 1988.

[14] B.Schumacher, M.D.Westmoreland "Optimal signal ensemble", arXiv:quant-ph/9912122.

[15] M.E.Shirokov "Conditions for equality between entanglement-assisted and unassisted classical capacities of a quantum channel", Problems of Information Transmission, V.48, N.2, P.85-101, 2012; arXiv:1105.1040.

[16] M.E.Shirokov "Monotonicity of the Holevo quantity: a necessary condition for equality in terms of a channel and its applications", arXiv:1106.3297.

[17] M.E.Shirokov "On reversibility of Bosonic linear channels", arXiv:1212.2354.